

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON,  
Plaintiff(s),  
v.  
SHEILA WASHINGTON , et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00513-JCM-NJK

## **Order Regarding Briefing Schedule For Discovery Motions**

Concurrently herewith, the Court is entering a scheduling order. The Court issues this order to advise the parties that discovery motions filed in this case will not be briefed according to the default schedule outlined in Local Rule 7-2(b), but will instead be briefed on shortened deadlines absent leave from the Court, *see* Local Rule IA 1-4 (the Court may alter the local rules).

“Discovery is supposed to proceed with minimal involvement of the Court.” *F.D.I.C. v. Butcher*, 116 F.R.D. 196, 203 (E.D. Tenn. 1986). Counsel should strive to be cooperative, practical and sensible, and should seek judicial intervention “only in extraordinary situations that implicate truly significant interests.” *In re Convergent Techs. Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328, 331 (N.D. Cal. 1985). Generally speaking, discovery disputes may be presented to the Court only after completion of a pre-filing conference. *See, e.g., Cardoza v. Bloomin' Brands, Inc.*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015). This pre-filing conference is not a mere technicality. Instead, the parties must “personally engage in two-way communication . . . to meaningfully discuss each contested discovery dispute in a genuine effort to avoid judicial intervention.” *ShuffleMaster, Inc.*

1 *v. Progressive Games, Inc.*, 170 F.R.D. 166, 171 (D. Nev. 1996). The consultation obligation  
2 “promote[s] a frank exchange between counsel to resolve issues by agreement or to at least narrow  
3 and focus matters in controversy before judicial resolution is sought.” *Nevada Power v. Monsanto*,  
4 151 F.R.D. 118, 120 (D. Nev. 1993). To meet this obligation, parties must “treat the informal  
5 negotiation process as a substitute for, and not simply a formalistic prerequisite to, judicial  
6 resolution of discovery disputes.” *Id.* This is done when the parties “present to each other the  
7 merits of their respective positions with the same candor, specificity, and support during the  
8 informal negotiations **as during the briefing of discovery motions.**” *Id.* (emphasis added).

9 Given the robust requirements for a pre-filing conference, there should be no need for  
10 discovery motions to be briefed pursuant to the default deadlines in the local rules in the vast  
11 majority of cases. Quite simply, even before a discovery motion is filed, the parties must have  
12 developed their respective arguments and must possess the relevant legal authority supporting  
13 those positions.<sup>1</sup> The Court therefore ORDERS that, absent leave for an extension being granted,  
14 **the responses to a discovery motion shall be filed within 4 days of the service of that motion**  
15 **and any reply shall be filed within 2 days of the service of the response.**<sup>2</sup>

16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 <sup>1</sup> Indeed, some courts require discovery disputes to be presented through a joint filing. See,  
e.g., C.D. Cal. Local Rule 37-2. While the Court will not require a joint statement, the parties may  
18 stipulate to filing one. Any such joint statement must separately address each disputed discovery  
request, providing the text of the request, the specific objection(s) to it, the arguments of the party  
opposing discovery supporting each objection, and the discovering parties’ arguments opposing  
19 each objection. Cf. C.D. Cal. Local Rule 37-2.1 (outlining similar procedure for presenting  
discovery disputes in the form of joint stipulations). The parties must meaningfully develop their  
arguments; merely identifying an objection or response thereto will not suffice. Cf. *Kor Media*  
20 *Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013). The page limitations established  
in the local rules will not apply to joint statements, but counsel must be as concise as possible.  
The joint statement must be complete in itself. The parties may not incorporate by reference  
21 arguments made elsewhere. The joint statement shall attach any declarations or exhibits that the  
parties wish to be considered. The joint statement shall be docketed as a “Stipulation for Order  
22 Resolving Discovery Dispute.”  
23

24 <sup>2</sup> The normal rules regarding calculating deadlines apply. No extra days will be added  
when service is completed electronically through CM/ECF, but three days will be added to the  
25 deadlines in cases in which service is completed by means enumerated in Rule 6(d) of the Federal  
Rules of Civil Procedure. Intervening weekend days and Court holidays count toward the deadline  
imposed. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(B). To the extent a deadline set herein falls on a weekend or  
Court holiday, the filing is due on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or Court holiday. See  
26 Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C). The Court reminds the parties that the CM/ECF system may  
automatically generate deadlines that are inconsistent with this order and, in such instances, this  
order controls. See Local Rule IC 3-1(d).

1 To the extent a more expedited briefing schedule is required under the circumstances or an  
2 order resolving the dispute is required within a shortened time, the discovery motion shall be filed  
3 in accordance with the requirements for emergency motions. *See, e.g., Cardoza*, 141 F. Supp. 3d  
4 at 1140-43.<sup>3</sup>

5 In the event a discovery dispute involves a non-party, the party involved in that dispute  
6 must provide the non-party with a copy of this order during the pre-filing conference and must  
7 certify that fact with its own filing.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: May 24, 2018

10   
11 Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>3</sup> This order and the deadlines set out herein do not apply to motions seeking only discovery  
sanctions, as the pre-filing conference requirements do not apply to such motions. *See, e.g.,*  
28 *Nationstar Mtg., LLC v. Flamingo Trails No. 7 Maintenance Assoc.*, 316 F.R.D. 327, 335-46 (D.  
Nev. 2016).